

**REMARKS**

**Summary of the Office Action**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 2003/0205970) in view of Kubota (US 6,429,584).

The Title of the Invention is objected to for allegedly not clearly being indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

The drawings are objected to for allegedly failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5).

**Summary of the Response to the Office Action**

Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention and the specification to correct minor errors. Accordingly, claims 1-9 are pending for consideration.

**Objections to the Specification and Drawings**

The Title of the Invention is objected to for allegedly not clearly being indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The drawings are objected to for allegedly failing to comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5).

Applicants have amended the Title of the Invention and the Specification in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the Title is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed, and that the drawings comply with the requirements of 37 C.F.R. § 1.84(p)(5).

**All Claims Define Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 1-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Park et al. (US 2003/0205970) in view of Kubota (US 6,429,584). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for at least the following reasons.

The present application was filed on June 30, 2003, and therefore is governed by 35 U.S.C. § 103(c), as revised on November 29, 1999. The subject matter of Park et al. and the present invention were, at the time the invention was made, commonly owned by LG.Philips LCD Co., Ltd. of Seoul, Korea. Therefore, the disclosure of Park et al. cannot preclude patentability of the present invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 should be withdrawn. Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 2-9 are allowable, at least because of their dependence on independent claim 1, and for the additional features that they recite.


**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request entry of the amendments, reconsideration and the timely allowance of all pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution.

If there are any other fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-0310. If a fee is required for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 not accounted for above, such as an extension is requested and the fee should also be charged to our Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**

By:   
David B. Hardy  
Reg. No. 47,362

Date: **January 28, 2005**

**CUSTOMER NO. 009629**  
**MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP**  
1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
(202) 739-3000